

Matthew Guerrero and Cynthia Valenzuela  
2695 Grell Lane  
Oceano, CA 93445

Re: County File Number SUB2012-00080  
APN: 062-303-084  
Continued Hearing Date: January 6, 2013

Dear Sir/Madam:

I live across the street from the property that is the subject of this proposed subdivision. I am opposed to this subdivision.

Please give your consideration to the background of my objection:

In 2004, when I first purchased and moved to 2695 Grell Lane (property number 5 on the attached map), the properties numbered 82, 83 and 84 were all one property. There was (and still is) one building on that one large parcel, on the section that is now labeled number 84 on the attached map. The remaining portion of the property, what is now the sections labeled 82 and 83, was all open space, filled with about 50 pine trees. All of the homes on this street were unique in style, on fairly large parcels of land, and constructed set back from the street.

At the time my husband and I bought our property, we held a restriction on the subject property, that any development or subdivision be limited to only one additional residence being built. The restriction was one paragraph of a document titled "Agreement Affecting Real Property" which contained various other provisions relating to other properties on Grell Lane.

In 2004 through 2005 the owner of the subject property made application to sub-divide the property into two additional parcels, to make the original large parcel into the three parcels, Project Name & Number Monteiro SUB2004-00176. At that time, several people who live on Grell Lane objected and voiced same at the public meetings. I also publicly objected, on the grounds that since there could only be one additional house built on this subject property, per the terms of the restriction I had on that property, there would be no need to divide it into three properties, and therefore the application should be denied.

My husband and I submitted to the Review Board the Agreement Affecting Real Property to the County for consideration in any decision on this 2004 subdivision. We were advised that the County's position was that the document was merely an agreement between individual property owners, such that enforcement of any of the provisions in the document would be private, not through any mechanism of enforcement by the County. The application was

obviously granted, in 2006, as there are in fact three parcels now, 82, 83 and 84 on the attached map.

In 2009 and 2010, there was subsequent litigation on this property filed in the San Luis Obispo Superior Court, which dispute was ultimately settled at mediation. The result of the County's allowing the subdivision of the subject original large parcel into the current three parcels, coupled with the subsequent litigation, resulted in Mr. Michael Dacey building two houses across the street from me.

The reason for this lengthy background is to provide context for my, and other Grell Lane residents,' opposition to the current application that is seeking to sub-divide the remaining large parcel, number 84 on the attached map. The proposed subdivision is objectionable because I am advised that the developer already has plans to build an additional home there – another home *in addition to* the flat roof building that is seen in the attached photos, while keeping the original home as well.

First, the large flat-roof building shown in the pictures is already more than one residence. It is not a single family residence, it's a duplex, with the addresses of 2710 and 2710A, so there are already two different families residing on the one property. To subdivide and add a third family with the additional vehicle traffic of residents and guests would be a significant and negative impact on the other residents of Grell Lane.

Second, please look closely at the photos in comparison to the aerial parcel map. The information on the street is that if the subdivision is approved, the residence will be constructed lengthwise along the wooden fence – that is a rectangular area that is about three cars wide. With two residences already on that property, sliding a third in there like a puzzle piece takes “urban infill” to a whole new level that hardly seems necessary or beneficial to the other residents on the street.

Third, when the 2004 Monteiro subdivision application was being reviewed, the Staff Report prepared in preparation for the Subdivision Review Board meeting of January 9, 2006, made the following comments regarding the Road:

“ROAD EXCEPTION REQUEST: The applicant has requested a road exception for Grell Lane since it serves more than five parcels. The request also includes abandonment of the Grell Lane as a public road. Public Works staff has reviewed the request and determined that an exception can be granted that allows for A-1 improvements instead of the normally required A-2 standards. *It was determined that Grell Lane should be abandoned as a public road because **the potential for future development accessing Grell Lane and the possibility of additional parcels being served by Grell Lane is remote.***” (emphasis added).

In other words, in response to prior requests or applications relating to the development of Grell Lane, the County's previous actions and decisions on those requests apparently

acknowledged the underlying reality that Grell Lane, even with the construction of the Fire Department turn-around, is a single lane private road that is essentially a cul de sac, and not able to support the existing parcels to be additionally subdivided to accommodate some maximum high density urban level of development.

Fourth, there has already been significant recent development on Grell Lane, i.e., the two new houses built directly across the street from my house, which development has completely changed the character of the street from the way it was even just a few short years ago. The two newer parcels are quite small and narrow, in comparison with the other properties on the street. The houses that are built on each are literally wedged in, right up on their side property lines, and also right up on the edge of the street, as compared to all of the other well set back homes on the street. As the pictures attached hereto show, they are also cookie-cutter floor plan throw ups, better suited to large subdivision-type development instead of the truly unique individual homes that are on Grell Lane, several of which were designed by Cal Poly architects.

For all of these reasons, I respectfully request that this body deny the subject application to further subdivide this property. Thank you.

Cynthia Valenzuela



Standing in the front yard of 2695 Grell Lane, looking across the street



From 2695 Grell Lane, looking across and slightly to the left





Continuing looking up Grell Lane from the driveway at 2695; the driveway to 2710 and 2710 A is on the left.



Approaching the subject property, 2710 and 2710A, from its driveway.





Facing the subject property, 2710 and 2710A Grell Lane



The side of 2710 Grell Lane, the area proposed to be subdivided into a new parcel for the purpose of building another home.





Two zoom ins of the side of 2710 Grell Lane, the area proposed to be subdivided into a new parcel for the purpose of building another home.



